

A class of Multidimensional Latent Class IRT models for ordinal polytomous item responses

Silvia Bacci^{*†}, Francesco Bartolucci^{*‡}, Michela Gnaldi^{*§}

January 24, 2012

Abstract

We propose a class of Item Response Theory models for items with ordinal polytomous responses, which extends an existing class of multidimensional models for dichotomously-scored items measuring more than one latent trait. In the proposed approach, the random vector used to represent the latent traits is assumed to have a discrete distribution with support points corresponding to different latent classes in the population. We also allow for different parameterizations for the conditional distribution of the response variables given the latent traits - such as those adopted in the Graded Response model, in the Partial Credit model, and in the Rating Scale model - depending on both the type of link function and the constraints imposed on the item parameters. For the proposed models we outline how to perform maximum likelihood estimation via the Expectation-Maximization algorithm. Moreover, we suggest a strategy for model selection which is based on a series of steps consisting of selecting specific features, such as the number of latent dimensions, the number of latent classes, and the specific parametrization. In order to illustrate the proposed approach, we analyze data deriving from a study on anxiety and depression as perceived by oncological patients.

KEYWORDS: EM algorithm; Graded Response Model; Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale; Partial Credit Model; Rating Scale Model; unidimensionality.

^{*}Department of Economics, Finance and Statistics, University of Perugia, Via A. Pascoli, 20, 06123 Perugia.

[†]*email:* sbacci@stat.unipg.it

[‡]*email:* bart@stat.unipg.it

[§]*email:* gnaldi@stat.unipg.it

1 Introduction

Item Response Theory (IRT) models are commonly used to analyze data deriving from the administration of questionnaires made of items with dichotomous or polytomous responses (also known, in the educational setting, as dichotomously or polytomously-scored items). Dichotomous responses are usually labelled as true or false, right or wrong, yes or no, whereas polytomous responses correspond to more than two options. Polytomous responses include both nominal and ordinal responses. In the former, there is no natural ordering in the item response categories. In the latter, which are of our interest here, each item has responses corresponding to a number of ordered categories (e.g., correct, partially correct, wrong). While nominal polytomous items are especially used to investigate customers' choices and preferences, ordinal polytomous items are widespread in several contexts, such as in education, marketing, and psychology. For a review about polytomous IRT models, see Hambleton and Swaminathan (1985), Van der Linden and Hambleton (1997), and Nering and Ostini (2010).

A number of models have been proposed in the psychometrical and statistical literature to analyze items with ordinal polytomous responses, and several taxonomies can be adopted. Among the most known, we remind those due to Samejima (1972), Molenaar (1983), and Thissen and Steinberg (1986) which, even though developed independently one another, are strongly related and overlapping (Samejima, 1996; Hemker et al., 2001). Combining these parameterizations with possible constraints on item discriminating and difficulty parameters, the most well known IRT models for polytomous responses result, such as the Graded Response model (GRM; Samejima, 1969), the Partial Credit model (PCM; Masters, 1982), the Rating Scale model (RSM; Andrich, 1978), and the Generalized Partial Credit Model (GPCM; Muraki, 1992). These models are based on the unidimensionality assumption and, for some of them, the normality assumption of this latent trait is explicitly introduced.

Several extensions of traditional IRT models for polytomous responses have been proposed in the literature in order to overcome some restrictive assumptions and to make the models more flexible and realistic. Firstly, some authors dealt with multidimensional extensions of IRT models to take into account that questionnaires are often designed to measure more than one latent trait. Among the main contributions in the context of IRT models for polytomous responses, we remind Duncan and Stenbeck (1987), Agresti (1993) and Kelderman and Rijkens (1994), who proposed a number of examples of loglinear multidimensional IRT models, Kelderman (1996) for a multidimensional version of the PCM, and Adams et al. (1997) for a wide class of Rasch type (Rasch, 1960; Wright and Masters, 1982) extended models; see Reckase (2009) for a thorough overview of this topic.

Another advance in the IRT literature concerns the assumption that the population under study is composed by homogeneous classes of individuals who have very similar latent characteristics (Lazarsfeld and Henry, 1968; Goodman, 1974). In some contexts, where the aim is to cluster individuals, this is a convenient assumption; in health care, for instance, by introducing this assumption we single out a certain number of clusters of patients receiving the same clinical treatment. Secondly, this assumption allows us to estimate the model in a semi-parametric way, namely without formulating any assumption on the latent trait distribution. Moreover, it is possible to implement the maximum marginal likelihood method making use of the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm

(Dempster et al., 1977), skipping in this way the problem of intractability of multidimensional integral which characterizes the marginal likelihood when a continuous latent variable is assumed. At this regards, Christensen et al. (2002) outline, through a simulation study, the computational problems encountered during the estimation process of a multidimensional model based on a multivariate normally distributed ability. See also Masters (1985), Langheine and Rost (1988), Heinen (1996), and Formann (2007) for a comparison between traditional IRT models with those formulated by a latent class approach. For some examples of discretized variants of IRT models we also remind Lindsay et al. (1991), Formann (1992), Hoijtink and Molenaar (1997), Vermunt (2001), and Smit et al. (2003). Another interesting example of combination between the IRT approach and latent class approach is represented by the mixed Rasch model for ordinal polytomous data (Rost, 1991; von Davier and Rost, 1995), builded as a mixture of latent classes with a separate Rasch model assumed to hold within each of these classes.

As concerns the combination of the two above mentioned extensions, in the context of dichotomously-scored items Bartolucci (2007) proposed a class of multidimensional latent class (LC) IRT models, where: (i) more latent traits are simultaneously considered and each item is associated with only one of them (between-item multidimensionality - for details see Adams et al. (1997); Zhang (2004)) and (ii) these latent traits are represented by a random vector with a discrete distribution common to all subjects (each support point of such a distribution identifies a different latent class of individuals). Moreover, in this class of models either a Rasch (Rasch, 1960) or a two-parameter logistic (2PL) parameterization (Birnbaum, 1968) may be adopted for the probability of a correct response to each item. Similarly to Bartolucci (2007), von Davier (2008) proposed the diagnostic model, which, as main difference, assumes fixed rather than free abilities. An interesting comparison of multidimensional IRT models based on continuous and discrete latent traits was performed by Haberman et al. (2008) in terms of goodness of fit, similarity of parameter estimates and computational time required.

The aim of the present paper is to extend the class of models of Bartolucci (2007) to the case of items for ordinal polytomous responses. The proposed extension is formulated so that different parameterizations may be adopted for the conditional distribution of the response variables, given the latent traits. We mainly refer to the classification criterion proposed by Molenaar (1983); see also Agresti (1990) and Van der Ark (2001). Relying on the type of link function, it allows to discern among: (i) graded response models, based on global (or cumulative) logits; (ii) partial credit models, which make use of local (or adjacent category) logits; and (iii) sequential models, based on continuation ratio logits. For each of these link functions, we explicitly consider the possible presence of constraints on item discrimination parameters and threshold difficulties. As concerns the first element, we take into account the possibility that all items have the same discriminating power against the possibility that they discriminate differently. Moreover, we discern the case in which each item differs from the others for different distances between the difficulties of consecutive response categories and the special case in which the distance between difficulty levels from category to category is the same for all items. On the basis of the choice of all the mentioned features (i.e., type of link function, item discriminant parameters, item difficulties), different parameterizations for ordinal responses are defined. We show how these parameterizations result in an extension of traditional IRT models, by introducing assumptions of multidimensionality and discreteness of latent traits.

In order to estimate each model in the proposed class, we outline an EM algorithm. Moreover, special attention is given to the model selection procedure, that aims at choosing the optimal number of latent classes, the type of link function, the number of latent dimensions and the allocation of items within each dimension, and the parameterization for the item discriminating and difficulty parameters.

In order to illustrate the proposed class of models, we analyze a dataset collected by a questionnaire on anxiety and depression of oncological patients, and formulated following the “Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale” (HADS) developed by Zigmond and Snaith (1983). Through this application, each step of the model selection procedure is illustrated and the characteristics of each latent class, in terms of estimated levels of the latent traits, are described with reference to the selected model.

In summary, the proposed class of models allows for (i) ordinal polytomous responses of different nature, (ii) multidimensionality and (iii) discreteness of latent traits, at the same time. As concerns the first point, our model includes different link functions that are suitable for a wide type of empirical data. Moreover, our formulation allows for estimating both abilities and probabilities, and the introduction of latent classes represents a semi-parametric approach that computationally simplifies, through an EM algorithm, the maximization of log-likelihood function during the estimation process. To our knowledge, there are not other contributions treating all these topics in a same unifying framework, even if the single aspects are separately included in several existing types of models, as above outlined.

The reminder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe some basic parameterizations for IRT models for items with ordinal responses. In Section 3 we describe the proposed class of multidimensional LC IRT models for items with ordinal responses. Section 4 is devoted to maximum likelihood estimation which is implemented through an EM algorithm; moreover, in the same section we treat the issue of model selection. In Section 5, the proposed class of models is illustrated through the analysis of a real dataset, whereas some final remarks are reported in Section 6.

2 Models for polytomous item responses

Let X_j denote the response variable for the j -th item of the questionnaire, with $j = 1, \dots, r$. This variable has l_j categories, indexed from 0 to $l_j - 1$. Moreover, in the unidimensional case, let

$$\lambda_{jx}(\theta) = p(X_j = x | \Theta = \theta), \quad x = 0, \dots, l_j - 1,$$

denote the probability that a subject with latent trait (or ability) level θ responds by category x to this item. Also let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\theta)$ denote the probability vector $(\lambda_{j0}(\theta), \dots, \lambda_{j,l_j-1}(\theta))'$, the elements of which sum up to 1.

The IRT models for polytomous responses that are here of interest may be expressed through the general formulation

$$g_x[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\theta)] = \gamma_j(\theta - \beta_{jx}), \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \quad x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1, \quad (1)$$

where $g_x(\cdot)$ is a link function specific of category x and γ_j and β_{jx} are item parameters

which are usually identified as *discrimination indices* and *difficulty levels* and on which suitably constraints may be assumed.

On the basis of the specification of the link function in (1) and on the basis of the adopted constraint on the item parameters, different unidimensional IRT models for polytomous responses result. In particular, the formulation of each of these models depends on:

1. *Type of link function:* We consider the link based on: (i) global (or cumulative) logits; (ii) local (or adjacent categories) logits; and (iii) continuation ratio logits. In the first case, the link function is defined as

$$g_x[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \log \frac{\lambda_{x|\theta}^{(j)} + \cdots + \lambda_{l_j-1|\theta}^{(j)}}{\lambda_{0|\theta}^{(j)} + \cdots + \lambda_{x-1|\theta}^{(j)}} = \log \frac{p(X_j \geq x|\theta)}{p(X_j < x|\theta)}, \quad x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1,$$

and compares the probability that item response is in category x or higher with the probability that it is in a lower category. Moreover, with local logits we have that

$$g_x[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\theta)] = \log \frac{\lambda_{x|\theta}^{(j)}}{\lambda_{x-1|\theta}^{(j)}} = \log \frac{p(X_j = x|\theta)}{p(X_j = x-1|\theta)}, \quad x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1,$$

and then the probability of each category x is compared with the probability of the previous category. Finally, with continuation ratio logits we have that

$$g_x[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\theta)] = \log \frac{\lambda_{x+1|\theta}^{(j)} + \cdots + \lambda_{l_j-1|\theta}^{(j)}}{\lambda_{x|\theta}^{(j)}} = \log \frac{p(X_j > x|\theta)}{p(X_j = x|\theta)}, \quad x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1,$$

and then the probability of a response in category x is compared with the probability associated to the previous category or higher.

Global logits are typically used when the trait of interest is assumed to be continuous but latent, so that it can be observed only when each subject reaches a given threshold on the latent continuum. On the contrary, local logits are used to identify one or more intermediate levels of performance on an item and to award a partial credit for reaching such intermediate levels. Finally, continuation ratio logit is useful when sequential cognitive processes are involved (e.g., problem solving or repeated trials), how it typically happens in the educational context. Note that the interpretation of continuation ratio logits is very different from that of local logits. The latter ones describe the transition from one category to an adjacent one given that one of these two categories have been chosen. Thus, each of these logits excludes any other categories. Differently, continuation ratio logits describe the transition between adjacent categories, given that the smallest between the two has been reached. IRT models based on global logits are also known as graded response models, those based on local logits are known as partial credit models. Moreover, IRT models based on continuation ratio logits are also called sequential models.

2. *Constraints on the discrimination parameters:* We consider: (i) a general situation in which each item may discriminate differently from the others and (ii) a special

case in which all the items discriminate in the same way, that is

$$\gamma_j = 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, r. \quad (2)$$

Note that, in both cases, we assume that, within each item, all response categories share the same γ_j , in order to keep the conditional probabilities away from crossing and so avoiding degenerate conditional response probabilities.

3. *Formulation of item difficulty parameters:* We consider: (i) a general situation in which the parameters β_{jx} are unconstrained and (ii) a special case in which these parameters are constrained so that the distance between difficulty levels from category to category is the same for each item (rating scale parameterization). Obviously, the second case makes sense when all items have the same number of response categories, that is $l_j = l$, $j = 1, \dots, r$. This constraint may be expressed as

$$\beta_{jx} = \beta_j + \tau_x, \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \quad x = 0, \dots, l-1, \quad (3)$$

where β_j indicates the difficulty of item j and τ_x is the difficulty of response category x for all j .

By combining the above constraints, we obtain four different specifications of the item parametrization, based on free or constrained discrimination parameters and on rating scale or free parameterization for difficulties. Therefore, also according to the type of link function, twelve different types of unidimensional IRT model for ordinal responses result. These models are listed in Table 1.

discrimination indices	difficulty levels	resulting parameterization	resulting model (depending on the type of logit)		
			global	local	continuation
free	free	$\gamma_j(\theta - \beta_{jx})$	GRM	GPCM	SM
free	constrained	$\gamma_j[\theta - (\beta_j + \tau_x)]$	RS-GRM	RS-RSM	RS-SM
constrained	free	$\theta - \beta_{jx}$	1P-GRM	PCM	SRM
constrained	constrained	$\theta - (\beta_j + \tau_x)$	1P-RS-GRM	RSM	SRSRM

Table 1: *List of unidimensional IRT models for ordinal polytomous responses which result from the different choices of the link function, constraints on the discrimination indices, and constraints on the difficulty levels.*

Abbreviations used for the models specified in Table 1 refer to the way the corresponding models are known in the literature. Thus, other than GRM, RSM, PCM, and GPCM already mentioned in Section 1 it is possible to identify: SM indicating the Sequential Model obtained as special case of the acceleration model of Samejima (1995), where the acceleration step parameter is constrained to one and the discriminant indices are all constant over the response categories; RS-GRM indicating the rating scale version of the GRM introduced by Muraki (1990); RS-GPCM and RS-SM that are rating scale versions of GPCM (Muraki, 1997) and SM, respectively; 1P-GRM (Van der Ark, 2001), 1P-RS-GRM (Van der Ark, 2001), and SRM (Sequential Rasch Model; Tutz, 1990) indicating versions with constant discrimination index corresponding to the GRM, RS-GRM, and SM models, respectively. Finally, by SRSRM we indicate the Sequential Rating

Scale Model of Tutz (1990). We observe that Table 1 identifies a hierarchy of models in correspondence with each type of link function.

As an illustration, consider that if we choose a global logit link function and the least restrictive parameterization for the item parameters, we obtain the GRM, that represents one of the most well known generalization of the 2PL model to items with ordinal responses. This generalization is based on the assumption

$$\log \frac{p(X_j \geq x|\theta)}{p(X_j < x|\theta)} = \gamma_j(\theta - \beta_{jx}), \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \quad x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1. \quad (4)$$

Moreover, by combining the local logit link and the most restrictive parameterization for the item parameters, the RSM results. It represents an extension of the Rasch model to items with ordinal responses, which is based on the assumption

$$\log \frac{p(X_j = x|\theta)}{p(X_j = x - 1|\theta)} = \theta - (\beta_j + \tau_x), \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \quad x = 1, \dots, l - 1. \quad (5)$$

Since all the models presented in Table 1 can be expressed in terms of nonlinear mixed models (Rijmen et al., 2003), a suitable and very common parameter estimation method is the maximum marginal log-likelihood (MML) method, which is based on integrating out the unknown individual parameters, so that only the item parameters need to be estimated. To treat the integral characterizing the marginal log-likelihood function, different approaches can be adopted (Rijmen et al. (2003) for details). Under the assumption that the latent trait has a normal distribution, the Gauss-Hermite quadrature can be adopted to compute this integral which is then maximized by a direct method (e.g., Newton-Raphson algorithm) or indirect (e.g., EM algorithm). Alternatively, we can adopt a quasi-likelihood approach or a Bayesian approach based on Markov Chain Monte Carlo methods. Once the model parameters have been estimated, person parameters can be estimated by treating item parameters as known and maximizing the log-likelihood with respect to the latent trait or, alternatively, using the expected value or the maximum value of the corresponding posterior distribution.

Among the above mentioned models, those based on Rasch type parametrization (i.e., PCM and RSM) may be also estimated through the conditional maximum likelihood (CML; Wright and Masters, 1982) method. This method allows us to estimate the item parameters without formulating any assumption on the latent trait distribution. It is based on maximizing the log-likelihood conditioned on the individual raw scores that, in the case of Rasch type models, represent a sufficient statistics for ability parameters. The resulting function only depends on the difficulty parameters that, therefore, can be consistently estimated. Tutz (1990) proposed a modified version of CML method to estimate the SRM and the SRSRM. Another estimation method used is the joint or unconditional maximum likelihood (Wright and Masters, 1982, for details) which, however, does not provide consistent parameter estimates.

3 The proposed class of models

In the following, we describe the multidimensional extension of the unidimensional IRT models for ordinal responses mentioned in the previous section, which is based on latent traits with a discrete distribution. We first present the assumptions on which the proposed class of models is based and, then, a formulation in matrix notation which is useful for the estimation.

We recall that the proposed class of models also represents a generalization to the case of ordinal polytomous responses of the class of multidimensional models proposed by Bartolucci (2007) for dichotomously-scored items.

3.1 Basic assumptions

Let s be the number of different latent traits measured by the items, let $\Theta = (\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_s)'$ be a vector of latent variables corresponding to these latent traits, and let $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_s)'$ denote one of its possible realizations. The random vector Θ is assumed to have a discrete distribution with k support points, denoted by $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k$, and probabilities $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k$, with $\pi_c = p(\Theta = \xi_c)$. Moreover, let δ_{jd} be a dummy variable equal to 1 if item j measures latent trait of type d and to 0 otherwise, with $j = 1, \dots, r$ and $d = 1, \dots, s$.

Coherently with the introduction of vector Θ , we redefine the conditional response probabilities

$$\lambda_{jx}(\theta) = p(X_j = x | \Theta = \theta), \quad x = 0, \dots, l_j - 1,$$

and we let $\lambda_j(\theta) = (\lambda_{j0}(\theta), \dots, \lambda_{j,l_j-1}(\theta))'$. Then, assumption (1) is generalized as follows

$$g_x(\lambda_j(\theta)) = \gamma_j \left(\sum_{d=1}^s \delta_{jd} \theta_d - \beta_{jx} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \quad x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1, \quad (6)$$

where the item parameters γ_j and β_{jx} may be subjected to the same parametrizations illustrated in Section 2. More precisely, on the basis of the constraints assumed on these parameters, we obtain different specifications of equation (1) which are reported in Table 1, where we distinguish the case of $s = 1$ from that of $s > 1$.

discrimination indices	difficulty levels	Number of latent traits	
		$s = 1$	$s > 1$
free	free	$\gamma_j(\theta - \beta_{jx})$	$\gamma_j(\sum_d \delta_{jd} \theta_d - \beta_{jx})$
free	constrained	$\gamma_j[\theta - (\beta_j + \tau_x)]$	$\gamma_j[\sum_d \delta_{jd} \theta_d - (\beta_j + \tau_x)]$
constrained	free	$\theta - \beta_{jx}$	$\sum_d \delta_{jd} \theta_d - \beta_{jx}$
constrained	constrained	$\theta - (\beta_j + \tau_x)$	$\sum_d \delta_{jd} \theta_d - (\beta_j + \tau_x)$

Table 2: *Resulting item parameterizations for $s = 1$ and $s > 1$.*

Each of the item parameterizations shown in Table 2 may be indifferently combined both with global, local, and continuation ratio logit link functions to obtain different types of multidimensional LC IRT models for ordinal responses, representing as many as generalizations of models as in Table 1. For instance, we may define the multidimensional

LC versions of GRM, defined through equation (4), and RSM, defined through equation (5), respectively as

$$\log \frac{p(X_j \geq x | \Theta = \theta)}{p(X_j < x | \Theta = \theta)} = \gamma_j \left(\sum_{d=1}^s \delta_{jd} \theta_d - \beta_{jx} \right), \quad x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1, \quad (7)$$

and

$$\log \frac{p(X_j = x | \Theta = \theta)}{p(X_j = x - 1 | \Theta = \theta)} = \sum_{d=1}^s \delta_{jd} \theta_d - (\beta_j + \tau_x), \quad x = 1, \dots, l - 1. \quad (8)$$

Note that when $l_j = 2$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, so that item responses are binary, equations (7) and (8) specialize, respectively, in the multidimensional LC 2PL model and in the multidimensional LC Rasch model, both of them described by Bartolucci (2007).

In all cases, the discreteness of the distribution of the random vector Θ implies that the manifest distribution of $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_r)'$ for all subjects in the c -th latent class is equal to

$$p(\mathbf{x}) = p(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{c=1}^k p(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | \Theta = \xi_c) \pi_c, \quad (9)$$

where, due to the classical assumption of *local independence*, we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{x} | c) = p(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | \Theta = \xi_c) &= \prod_{j=1}^r p(X_j = x_j | \Theta = \xi_c) = \\ &= \prod_{d=1}^s \prod_{j \in \mathcal{J}_d} p(X_j = x_j | \Theta_d = \xi_{cd}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_d$ denotes the subset of $\mathcal{J} = \{1, \dots, r\}$ containing the indices of the items measuring the d -th latent trait, with $d = 1, \dots, s$ and ξ_{cd} denoting the d -th elements of ξ_c .

In order to ensure the identifiability of the proposed models, suitable constraints on the parameters are required. With reference to the general equation (6), we require that, for each latent trait, one discriminant index is equal to 1 and one difficulty parameter is equal to 0. More precisely, let j_d be a specific element of $\mathcal{J}_d$, say the first. Then, when the discrimination indices are not constrained to be constant as in (2), we assume that

$$\gamma_{j_d} = 1, \quad d = 1, \dots, s.$$

Moreover, with free item difficulties we assume that

$$\beta_{j_d 1} = 0, \quad d = 1, \dots, s, \quad (11)$$

whereas with a rating scale parameterization based on (3), we assume

$$\beta_{j_d} = 0, \quad d = 1, \dots, s, \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_1 = 0. \quad (12)$$

Coherently with the mentioned identifiability constraints, the number of free parameters of a multidimensional LC IRT model with ordinal responses is obtained by summing

the number of free probabilities π_c , the number of ability parameters ξ_{cd} , the number of free item difficulty parameters β_{jx} , and that of free item discrimination parameters γ_j . We note that the number of free parameters does not depend on the type of logit, but only on the type of parametrization assumed on item discrimination and difficulty parameters, as shown in Table 3. In any case, the number of probabilities is equal to $k - 1$ and the number of ability parameters is equal to sk . However, the number of free item difficulty parameters is given by $[\sum_{j=1}^r (l_j - 1) - s]$ under an unconstrained difficulties parameterization and it is given by $[(r - s) + (l - 2)]$ under a rating scale parameterization. Finally, the number of free item discrimination parameters is equal to $(r - s)$ under an unconstrained discrimination parameterization, being 0 otherwise.

discrimination indices	difficulty levels	Number of free parameters (#par)
free	free	$(k - 1) + sk + [\sum_{j=1}^r (l_j - 1) - s] + (r - s)$
free	constrained	$(k - 1) + sk + [(r - s) + (l - 2)] + (r - s)$
constrained	free	$(k - 1) + sk + [\sum_{j=1}^r (l_j - 1) - s]$
constrained	constrained	$(k - 1) + sk + [(r - s) + (l - 2)]$

Table 3: *Number of free parameters for different constraints on item discrimination and difficulty parameters.*

3.2 Formulation in matrix notation

In order to efficiently implement parameter estimation, in this section we express the above described class of models by using the matrix notation. In order to simplify the description, we consider the case in which every item has the same number of response categories, that is $l_j = l$, $j = 1, \dots, r$; the extension to the general case in which items may also have a different number of response categories is straightforward. In the following, by $\mathbf{0}_a$ we denote a column vector of a zeros, by $\mathbf{O}_{ab}$ an $a \times b$ matrix of zeros, by $\mathbf{I}_a$ an identity matrix of size a , by $\mathbf{1}_a$ a column vector of a ones. Moreover, we use the symbol $\mathbf{u}_{ab}$ to denote a column vector of a zeros with the b -th element equal to one and $\mathbf{T}_a$ to denote an $a \times a$ lower triangular matrix of ones. Finally, by $\otimes$ we indicate the Kronecker product.

As concerns the link function used in (6), it may be expressed in a general way to include different types of parameterizations (Glonek and McCullagh, 1995; Colomby and Forcina, 2001) as follows:

$$\mathbf{g}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = \mathbf{C} \log[\mathbf{M}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})], \quad (13)$$

where the vector $\mathbf{g}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ has elements $g_x[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$ for $x = 1, \dots, l - 1$. Moreover, $\mathbf{C}$ is a matrix of constraints of the type

$$\mathbf{C} = (-\mathbf{I}_{l-1} \quad \mathbf{I}_{l-1}),$$

whereas, for the global logit link, matrix $\mathbf{M}$ is equal to

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{T}_{l-1} & \mathbf{0}_{l-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-1} & \mathbf{T}'_{l-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

for the local logit link it is equal to

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{l-1} & \mathbf{0}_{l-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-1} & \mathbf{I}_{l-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

and for the continuation ratio logit link it is given by

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{l-1} & \mathbf{0}_{l-1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{l-1} & \mathbf{T}'_{l-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

How to obtain the probability vector $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ on the basis of a vector of logits defined as in (13) is described in Colombi and Forcina (2001), where a method to compute the derivative of a suitable vector of canonical parameters for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with respect to these logits may be found.

Once the ability and difficulty parameters are included in the single vector $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and taking into account that the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ has k support points, assumption (6) may be expressed through the general formula

$$\mathbf{g}[\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j(\boldsymbol{\xi}_c)] = \gamma_j \mathbf{Z}_{cj} \boldsymbol{\phi}, \quad c = 1, \dots, k, \quad j = 1, \dots, r,$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_{cj}$ is a suitable design matrix. The structure of the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ and of these design matrices depend on the type of constraint assumed on the difficulty parameters, as we explain below.

When the difficulty parameters are unconstrained, $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a column vector of size $sk + r(l-1) - s$, which is obtained from

$$(\xi_{11}, \dots, \xi_{1s}, \dots, \xi_{ks}, \beta_{11}, \dots, \beta_{1,l_1-1}, \dots, \beta_{r,l_r-1})'$$

by removing the parameters constrained to be 0; see (11). Accordingly, for $c = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, r$, the design matrix $\mathbf{Z}_{cj}$ is obtained by removing suitable columns from the matrix

$$(\mathbf{1}_{l-1}(\mathbf{u}_{kc} \otimes \mathbf{u}_{sd})' \quad \mathbf{u}'_{rj} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{l-1}),$$

where d is the dimension measured by item j . On the other hand, under a rating scale parameterization, $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is a vector of size $sk + (r-s) + (l-2)$ which is obtained from

$$(\xi_{11}, \dots, \xi_{1s}, \dots, \xi_{ks}, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_{l-1})'$$

by removing the parameters constrained to be 0 in (12). Accordingly, the design matrix $\mathbf{Z}_{cj}$ is obtained by removing specific columns from

$$(\mathbf{1}_{l-1}(\mathbf{u}_{kc} \otimes \mathbf{u}_{sd})' \quad \mathbf{1}_{l-1} \mathbf{u}'_{rj} \quad \mathbf{I}_{l-1}),$$

where, again, d is the dimension measured by item j .

4 Likelihood inference

In this section, we deal with likelihood inference for the models proposed in the previous section. In particular, we first show how to compute the model log-likelihood and how to maximize it by an EM algorithm. Finally, we deal with model selection. All the computational procedures are implemented in Matlab and R and are available on request from authors.

4.1 Model estimation

On the basis of an observed sample of dimension n , the log-likelihood of a model formulated as proposed in Section 3 may be expressed as

$$\ell(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} n_{\mathbf{x}} \log[p(\mathbf{x})],$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is the vector containing all the free model parameters, $n_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the frequency of the response configuration $\mathbf{x}$, $p(\mathbf{x})$ is computed according to (9) and (10) as a function of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, and by $\sum_{\mathbf{x}}$ we mean the sum extended to all the possible response configurations $\mathbf{x}$.

In order to maximize $\ell(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ we use an EM algorithm (Dempster et al., 1977) that is implemented in a similar way as described in Bartolucci (2007), to which we refer for some details. First of all, denoting by $m_{c,\mathbf{x}}$ the (unobserved) frequency of the response configuration $\mathbf{x}$ and the latent class c , the *complete* log-likelihood is equal to

$$\ell^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \sum_c \sum_{\mathbf{x}} m_{c,\mathbf{x}} \log[p(\mathbf{x}|c)\pi_c]. \quad (14)$$

Now we denote by $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$ the subvector of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ which contains the free latent class probabilities and by $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2$ the subvector containing the remaining free parameters. More precisely, we let $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\pi}$, with $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_2, \dots, \pi_k)'$, and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2 = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}', \boldsymbol{\phi}')'$, where $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is obtained by removing from $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r)'$ the parameters which are constrained to be equal to 1 to ensure identifiability. Obviously, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is not present when constraint (2) is adopted. Then, we can decompose the complete log-likelihood as

$$\ell^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \ell_1^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1) + \ell_2^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_2),$$

with

$$\ell_1^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1) = \sum_c m_c \log \pi_c, \quad (15)$$

$$\ell_2^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_2) = \sum_c \sum_j \mathbf{m}'_{cj} \log \lambda_{cj}, \quad (16)$$

where $m_c = \sum_{\mathbf{x}} m_{c,\mathbf{x}}$ is the number of subjects in latent class c and $\mathbf{m}_{cj}$ is the column vector with elements $\sum_{\mathbf{x}} I(x_j = x) m_{c,\mathbf{x}}$, $x = 1, \dots, l_j - 1$, with $I(\cdot)$ denoting the indicator function.

The EM algorithm alternates the following two steps until convergence:

E-step: compute the conditional expected value of $\ell^*(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ given the observed data and the current value of the parameters;

M-step: maximize the above expected value with respect to $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, so that this parameter vector results updated.

The E-step consists of computing, for every c and $\mathbf{x}$, the expected value of $m_{c,\mathbf{x}}$ given $n_{\mathbf{x}}$ as follows

$$\hat{m}_{c,\mathbf{x}} = n_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{p(\mathbf{x}|c)\pi_c}{\sum_h p(\mathbf{x}|h)\pi_h}$$

and then substituting these expected frequencies in (14). On the basis of $\hat{m}_{c,\mathbf{x}}$ we can obtain the expected frequencies $\hat{m}_c$ and $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{cj}$ which, once substituted in (15) and (16), allow us to obtain the expected values of $\ell_1^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1)$ and $\ell_2^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_2)$, denoted by $\hat{\ell}_1^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1)$ and $\hat{\ell}_2^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_2)$, respectively.

At the M-step, the function obtained as described above is maximized with respect to $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ as follows. First of all, regarding the parameters in $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$ we have an explicit solution given by

$$\pi_c = \frac{\hat{m}_c}{n}, \quad c = 2, \dots, k,$$

which corresponds to the maximum of $\hat{\ell}_1^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1)$. To update the other parameters, we maximize $\hat{\ell}_2^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_2)$ by a Fisher-scoring algorithm that we illustrate in the following.

The Fisher-scoring algorithm alternates a step in which the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is updated with a step in which the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is updated. The first step consists of adding to the current value of each free γ_j the ratio s_{2j}^*/f_{2j}^* , where s_{2j}^* denotes the score for $\hat{\ell}_2^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_2)$ with respect to γ_j and f_{2j}^* denotes the corresponding information computed at the current value of the parameters. These have the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{2j}^* &= \sum_c \sum_j (\mathbf{Z}_{cj}\boldsymbol{\phi})' \mathbf{R}_{cj}' (\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{cj} - \hat{m}_c \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj}), \\ f_{2j}^* &= \sum_c \hat{m}_c \sum_j (\mathbf{Z}_{cj}\boldsymbol{\phi})' \mathbf{R}_{cj}' [\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj}'] \mathbf{R}_{cj} (\mathbf{Z}_{cj}\boldsymbol{\phi}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{R}_{cj}$ is the derivative matrix of the canonical parameter vector for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj}$ with respect to the vector of logits in (13); see Colombi and Forcina (2001). Then, the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is updated by adding the quantity $(\mathbf{F}_2^*)^{-1} \mathbf{s}_2^*$, where $\mathbf{s}_2^*$ is the score vector for $\hat{\ell}_2^*(\boldsymbol{\eta}_2)$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and $\mathbf{F}_2^*$ denotes the corresponding information computed at the current parameter value, which have the following expressions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}_2^* &= \sum_c \sum_j \gamma_j \mathbf{Z}_{cj}' \mathbf{R}_{cj}' (\hat{\mathbf{m}}_{cj} - \hat{m}_c \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj}), \\ \mathbf{F}_2^* &= \sum_c \hat{m}_c \sum_j \gamma_j^2 \mathbf{Z}_{cj}' \mathbf{R}_{cj}' [\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj}) - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{cj}'] \mathbf{R}_{cj} \mathbf{Z}_{cj}. \end{aligned}$$

As usual, we suggest to initialize the EM algorithm by a deterministic rule and by a multi-start strategy based on random starting values which are suitable generated. In this way we can deal with the multimodality of the model likelihood.

4.2 Model selection

The formulation of a specific model in the class of multidimensional LC IRT models for ordinal responses univocally depends on: (i) the number of latent classes (k); (ii) the adopted parameterization in terms of link function $g_x(\cdot)$ and constraints on the item parameters γ_j and β_{jx} , and (iii) the number (s) of latent dimensions and the corresponding allocation of items within each dimension (δ_{jd} , $j = 1, \dots, r$, $d = 1, \dots, s$). Thus, the model selection implies the adoption of a number of choices, for each of the previously mentioned aspects, by using suitable criteria. In the following, we mainly refer on the likelihood ratio (LR) test and on the Bayesian (Schwarz, 1978) information criterion (BIC). Firstly, we briefly recall these methods; then, we illustrate in detail the suggested model selection procedure.

4.2.1 Criteria for model selection

As it is well known, given a certain hypothesis denoted by H_0 , the LR test is based on the statistic

$$D = -2(\hat{\ell}_0 - \hat{\ell}),$$

where $\hat{\ell}_0$ and $\hat{\ell}$ denote the maximum of log-likelihood of the reduced model which incorporates H_0 and under the general model, respectively. Under this hypothesis, and provided that suitable regularity conditions hold, LR statistics is asymptotically distributed as a χ_q^2 , where q is given by the difference in the number of parameters between the two nested models being compared. An asymptotically equivalent alternative to LR test, is the Wald test, which, however, requires to compute the information matrix of the model.

Differently from the LR (and the Wald) statistics, information criteria do not provide neither a test of a model in the usual sense of testing a null hypothesis nor information about the way a model fits the data in absolute terms. However, they offer a relative measure of lost information when a given model is used to describe observed data. Besides, they are particularly useful to select among two or more general models, especially non-nested models, that cannot be compared by means of LR or Wald tests.

Different types of information criteria have been proposed in the statistical literature, and among them we prefer the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC, Schwarz, 1978), which is based on introducing a penalty term in the model to take into account the number of parameters. More precisely, this criterion is based on the index:

$$BIC = -2\hat{\ell} + \log(n)\#\text{par},$$

where $\hat{\ell}$ is the maximum value of the log-likelihood of the model of interest, and $\#\text{par}$ is the number of free parameters defined in Table 3. The smallest the BIC index is, the better is the model fitting. Therefore, among a set of competing models, we choose that with the minimum BIC value.

BIC has to be preferred to other information criteria, because it satisfies some nice properties. Mainly, under certain regularity conditions it is asymptotically consistent (?). Moreover, since it applies a larger penalty for additional parameters (for reasonable sample sizes) in comparison with other criteria, BIC tends to select more parsimonious models.

4.2.2 Model selection procedure

As stressed at the beginning of this section, the specification of a multidimensional LC IRT model for ordinal items implies a number of choices. A model selection procedure is here proposed which is based on the following sequence of ordered steps:

1. selection of the optimal number k of latent classes;
2. selection of the type of link function;
3. selection of the number of latent dimensions and item allocation within each dimension;
4. selection of constraints on the item discriminating and difficulty parameters.

These steps are described in more detail in the following.

1. *Selection of the number of latent classes.* To detect the optimal number k of latent classes, it is useful to proceed by comparing models that differ only in the number of latent classes, all other features being equal. More precisely, we suggest to adopt the standard LC model (Goodman, 1974), characterized by one dimension for each item. In this way, no choice on the link function and the item parameterization is requested; also, any restrictive assumptions on item dimensionality is avoided.

To compare LC models we rely on BIC, as it is not feasible to compare LC models with different number of latent classes through an LR test statistic. In particular, we fit the LC model with increasing k values; then, the value just before the first increasing BIC index is taken as optimal number of latent classes.

A crucial problem with LC models is represented by the multimodality of the likelihood function. To avoid that the choice of k falls in correspondence of a local - rather than global - maximum point, we suggest to repeat the estimation process by randomly varying the starting values of the model parameters. Then, for each possible value of k , we select the highest obtained log-likelihood value and, consequently, the smallest estimated BIC value.

2. *Selection of the logit link function.* As described in Section 2, it is possible to choose among three different types of logit: local logits, global logits, and continuation ratio logits. In particular, we perform the comparison between models on the basis of the mentioned logit functions and adopting BIC, which is here preferred to the LR test statistic as the latter cannot be validly used when models are not nested. Besides, when comparing the models, we choose the number of latent classes as selected in the previous step and we adopt the same multidimensional latent structure, that is with one dimension for each item. As concerns the item parameterization, we suggest to choose the most general one, which is based on both free item discriminating parameters and on free item difficulties parameters.

Obviously, since it can happen that no relevant difference in the goodness of fit of the competing models comes out (i.e., BIC index assumes very similar values), the choice of the type of logit should also take into account the different interpretations behind the three types of logits; see also Maydeu-Olivares et al. (1994) and Samejima (1996).

3. *Selection of dimensions.* Detection of latent traits is of main interest when estimating multidimensional IRT models. Several authors have dealt with testing unidimensionality in connection with Rasch type models. One of the main contributions is due to Martin-Löf (1973), who developed an LR test for the unidimensionality assumption against the alternative that the items consist of two subsets, defined in advance, each measuring one latent trait. This test has been generalized through a conditional non-parametric approach by Christensen et al. (2002) to the case of polytomous items and to cases with more than two dimensions.

To the aim of detecting latent traits in a more general context than that of Rasch type models, the LR statistic may be used to test the unidimensionality of a set of items against a specific multidimensional alternative, being the null hypothesis specialized as

$$H_0 : \theta_{d_1 c} = a_{d_1 d_2} + b_{d_1 d_2} \theta_{d_2 c}, \quad \forall d_1 \neq d_2 = 1, \dots, s,$$

for two constants $a_{d_1 d_2}$ and $b_{d_1 d_2}$, where the second is equal to 1 if the parametrization based on the constant discrimination indices is assumed.

For instance, in the case of two dimensions, we compare a model in which these dimensions are collapsed (unidimensionality assumption) with a model in which they are kept distinct (bidimensionality assumption), all other elements being equal, in accordance with the results of the previous steps. On the basis of this principle, Bartolucci (2007) proposes a model-based hierarchical clustering procedure that can also be applied for the extended models here proposed to take into account ordinal items and that allows us to detect groups of items that measure the same latent trait.

4. *Choice of the item discriminating and difficulty parameterization.* This step consists of the choice of the possible constraints on the discriminating and difficulty parameters. Four different types of model may be defined by combining free or constrained γ_j parameters with free or constrained β_{jx} parameters. Once the other elements of the model have been defined through the previous steps, we may perform the comparison among the four models on the basis of the LR (or Wald) test. Indeed, the null hypothesis H_0 we are testing when we compare a model with free γ_j with a model with constrained γ_j is the same as that expressed in (2). Similarly, by decomposing the item difficulty parameters as sum of two components, that is $\beta_{jx} = \beta_j + \tau_{jx}$, where τ_{jx} is referred to item j and category x , and maintaining the same assumption about discriminating parameters, we easily realize that hypothesis (3) is equivalent to

$$H_0 : \tau_{jx} = \tau_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, r, \quad x = 1, \dots, l-1,$$

which can be still tested by an LR statistic.

5 Application to measurement of anxiety and depression

The data used to illustrate the proposed class of polytomous LC IRT models concerns a sample of 201 oncological Italian patients who were asked to fill in questionnaires about their health and perceived quality of life. Here we are interested in anxiety and depression, as assessed by the “Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale” (HADS) developed by Zigmond and Snaith (1983). The questionnaire is composed by 14 polytomous items equally divided between the two dimensions:

1. anxiety (7 items: 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12);
2. depression (7 items: 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 13, 14).

Apparently, within this context of study, the assumption of unidimensionality might be not realistic. Thus, the adoption of the proposed class of models, rather than a unidimensional IRT model, appears more suitable and well more convenient, as it allows to detect homogeneous classes of individuals who have similar latent characteristics, so that patients in the same class will receive the same clinical treatment.

All items of the HADS questionnaire have four response categories: the minimum value 0 corresponds to a low level of anxiety or depression, whereas the maximum value 3 corresponds to a high level of anxiety or depression. Table 4 shows the distribution of item responses among the four categories, distinguishing between the two supposed dimensions.

Item	Response category				Total
	0	1	2	3	
2	35.3	52.7	8.0	4.0	100.0
6	39.8	46.3	10.0	4.0	100.0
7	46.3	22.4	21.9	9.5	100.0
8	19.4	49.3	24.9	6.5	100.0
10	7.0	40.8	44.3	8.0	100.0
11	30.8	49.8	11.4	8.0	100.0
12	34.3	46.3	14.9	4.5	100.0
Anxiety	30.4	43.9	19.3	6.3	100.0
1	43.8	32.8	16.4	7.0	100.0
3	56.7	29.9	9.0	4.5	100.0
4	31.8	54.7	11.9	1.5	100.0
5	46.3	38.8	13.4	1.5	100.0
9	9.0	27.9	55.2	8.0	100.0
13	42.3	42.3	11.4	4.0	100.0
14	30.8	37.3	28.9	3.0	100.0
Depression	37.2	37.7	20.9	4.2	100.0

Table 4: *Distribution of HADS item responses (row percentage frequencies).*

Altogether, responses are mainly concentrated in categories 0 and 1 both for anxiety and depression, whereas category 3, that denotes high levels of psychopathological disturbs, is selected less than 10% of the times for each item. By summing item responses, it is possible to obtain, for each patient, a score indicating a raw measure of anxiety and

depression: the closer the raw score is to the minimum value 0, the lower the level of anxiety or depression is, and viceversa. The mean raw score observed for the entire sample is very similar through the two dimensions, being 7.11 for anxiety and 7.17 for depression (standard deviation is equal to 4.15 and 4.16, respectively). Correlation between scores on anxiety and scores on depression is very high; it is equal to 0.98.

To proceed to the model selection, the four ordered steps suggested in Section 4.2.2 are followed. We recall that the first step consists of detecting the optimal number $\hat{k}$ of latent classes. To this aim, the standard LC model is employed and a comparison among models which differ by the number of latent classes is performed for $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$. The results of this preliminary fitting are reported in Table 5, where, to avoid the multimodality problem, results are referred both to deterministic and to random starting values.

k	Deterministic start			Random start		
	$\hat{\ell}$	#par	BIC	$\hat{\ell}(\max)$	#par	BIC(min)
1	-3153.151	42	6529.040	-3153.151	42	6529.040
2	-2814.635	85	6080.051	-2814.635	85	6080.051
3	-2677.822	128	6034.468	-2674.484	128	6027.791
4	-2645.435	171	6197.736	-2608.570	171	6104.805

Table 5: *Standard LC models: log-likelihood ($\hat{\ell}$), number of parameters, and BIC values for $k = 1, \dots, 4$ latent classes; in boldface is the smallest BIC value, selected with deterministic and random starts.*

On the basis of the adopted selection criterium, we choose $\hat{k} = 3$ as optimal number of latent classes as, in correspondence of this number of latent classes, the smallest estimated BIC value is observed, both with a deterministic and random initialization of the EM algorithm.

As regard to the second step and the choice of the best logit link function, a comparison between a graded response type model and a partial credit type model is carried out by assuming $\hat{k} = 3$ latent classes, free item discriminating and difficulties parameters, a completely general multidimensional structure for the data (i.e., r dimensions, one for each item), and basing the comparison on the BIC index. Note that the continuation ratio logit link function is not suitable in this context, because the item response process does not consist of a sequence of successive steps. Table 6 shows that a global logit link has to be preferred to a local logit link. Also, it can be observed that a graded response type model has a better fit than the standard LC model, as the BIC value observed for the former is smaller than that detected for the latter (see Table 5).

	Global logit	Local logit
$\hat{\ell}$	-2726.348	-2741.321
#par	72	72
BIC	5834.534	5864.479

Table 6: *Graded response and partial credit type models with $\hat{k} = 3$: log-likelihood ($\hat{\ell}$), number of parameters, and BIC values; in boldface is the smallest BIC value.*

Once we have chosen the global logit as the best link function, we carry on with the test of unidimensionality. An LR test is used to compare models which differ on account of their dimensional structure, all other elements being equal (i.e., free item discriminating and difficulty parameters), that is (i) a graded response model with r -dimensional structure, (ii) a graded response model with bidimensional structure (i.e., anxiety and depression), and (iii) a graded response model with unidimensional structure (i.e., all the items belong to the same dimension). For the sake of completeness, log-likelihood and BIC values are also provided for each model considered. On account of both BIC and the LR test, the hypothesis of unidimensionality may be accepted (see Table 7). This result is coherent with a similar analysis performed on the same data by Bacci and Bartolucci (to appear), where item responses were dichotomized and a Rasch parameterization was adopted.

Model	$\hat{\ell}$	#par	BIC	Deviance	p -value
r -dimensional	-2726.348	72	5834.534	—	—
bidimensional	-2731.249	60	5780.696	9.802	0.633
unidimensional	-2731.894	59	5776.682	1.290	0.256

Table 7: r -dimensional, bidimensional, and unidimensional graded response models with $\hat{k} = 3$: log-likelihood, number of parameters, BIC value, and LR test results (deviance and p -value); in boldface the smallest BIC value.

As previously outlined, the choice of the number of parameters per item depends on both the presence of a constant/non-constant discriminating index (γ_j), and of a constant/non-constant threshold difficulty parameter (β_{jx}), for each item. In our application, this implies a comparison among four models, in accordance with the classification adopted in Table 1. The parameterization is chosen on account of the unidimensional data structure and the previously selected global logit link function. Besides, because the compared models are nested, the parameterization is selected on the basis of an LR test. Again, for the sake of completeness, log-likelihood and BIC values are also provided for each model considered.

The analyses show (Table 8) that between GRM and RS-GRM, GRM has to be preferred to RS-GRM, while between models GRM and 1P-GRM, the latter has to be preferred. Besides, as model 1P-GRM has a better fit than model 1P-RS-GRM, then 1P-GRM has to be preferred model among the four considered, that is the graded response type model with free β_{jx} parameters and constant γ_j parameters. Such a result is achieved by taking into account both the BIC criterium and the LR test.

As the sequence of the previously described steps may be considered partly arguable, it can be also shown that the same results - in terms of link function, item parameterization and dimensionality choice - would have been obtained if each of such models were compared at once accounting for log-likelihood and BIC values as selection criteria. Indeed, Table 9 shows that the smallest BIC value is observed when selecting: (i) a global logit link function; (ii) constrained γ_j parameters and free β_{jx} parameters, that is, a 1P-GRM model; and (iii) assuming a unidimensional structure for the data.

The estimates of support points $\hat{\xi}_c$ and probabilities $\hat{\pi}_c$, $c = 1, 2, 3$, under the selected unidimensional 1P-GRM model are shown in Table 10. On the basis of these results, we

Model	$\hat{\ell}$	#par	BIC	Deviance	p -value
GRM	-2731.894	59	5776.682	—	—
RS-GRM	-2795.570	33	5766.149	127.353 (vs GRM)	0.000
1P-GRM	-2741.285	46	5726.521	18.782 (vs GRM)	0.130
1P-RS-GRM	-2844.518	20	5795.102	206.467 (vs 1P-GRM)	0.000

Table 8: *Item parameters selection: log-likelihood, number of parameters, BIC values, and LR test results (deviance and p-value) between nested graded response models with $k = 3$ and $s = 1$; in boldface the smallest BIC value.*

Dimensionality	Item parameters		Global logit		Local logit	
	γ_j	β_{jx}	$\hat{\ell}$	BIC	$\hat{\ell}$	BIC
r -dimensional	free/constr.	free	-2726.347	5834.534	-2741.321	5864.479
	free/constr.	constrained	-2815.568	5875.088	-2836.766	5917.484
bidimensional	free	free	-2731,249	5780,696	-2749,839	5817,877
	constrained	free	-2740,658	5735,875	-2764,787	5784,132
	free	constrained	-2798,959	5778,230	-2835,611	5851,534
	constrained	constrained	-2843,227	5803,127	-2869,223	5855,120
unidimensional	free	free	-2731,894	5776,682	-2750,214	5813,323
	constrained	free	-2741,285	5726,521	-2765,129	5774,211
	free	constrained	-2795,570	5766,149	-2833,179	5841,366
	constrained	constrained	-2844,518	5795,102	-2870,178	5846,422

Table 9: *Log-likelihood and BIC values for the global and local logit link functions, taking into account the dimensional structure (r -dimensional/bidimensional/ unidimensional) and the item parameters (depending on whether they are free/constraint); in boldface is the smallest BIC value.*

conclude that patients who suffer from psychopathological disturbs are mostly represented in the first two classes, whereas only the 16.7% of the subjects belong to the third class. Furthermore, patients belonging to class 1 present the least severe conditions, whereas patients in class 3 present the worst conditions.

Dimension	Latent class c		
	1	2	3
Psychopathological disturbs	-0.776	1.183	3.418
Probability	0.342	0.491	0.167

Table 10: *Estimated support points $\hat{\xi}_c$ and probabilities $\hat{\pi}_c$ of latent classes for the unidimensional 1P-GRM.*

6 Concluding remarks

In this article, we extend the class of multidimensional latent class (LC) Item Response Theory (IRT) models (Bartolucci, 2007) for dichotomously-scored items to the case of ordinal polytomously-scored items. The proposed models are formulated in a general way, so that several different parameterizations may be adopted for the distribution of the response variable, conditioned to the vector of latent traits. The classification criteria we use are based on three main elements: the type of link function, which may be based on global, local, or continuation ratio logits, the type of constraints on item discriminating parameters, that may be completely free or kept all equal to one, and the type of constraints on item difficulty parameters, that may be formulated so that each item has different distances between consecutive response categories or in a more parsimonious way, where the distance between difficulty levels from category to category within each item is the same across all items. According to the way these criteria are combined, twelve possible parameterizations result, some of which are well-known in the psychometrical literature, such as those referred to the Graded Response Model (Samejima, 1969), the Partial Credit Model (Masters, 1982), and the Rating Scale Model (Andrich, 1978).

The proposed class of models is more flexible in comparison with traditional formulations of IRT models, often based on restrictive assumptions, such as unidimensionality and normality of latent trait. In particular, the assumption of multidimensionality allows us to take more than one latent trait into account at the same time and to study the correlation between latent traits. Moreover, in the proposed class of models, no specific assumption about the distribution of latent traits is necessary, since a latent class approach is adopted, in which the latent traits are represented by a random vector with a discrete distribution common to all subjects. In this way, subjects with similar latent traits are assigned to the same latent class, so as to detect homogeneous subpopulations of subjects. Moreover, the latent class approach presents a notable simplification from the computational point of view with respect to the case of continuous latent traits, where the marginal likelihood is characterized by a multidimensional integral difficult to treat.

In order to make inference on the proposed model, we show how the log-likelihood may be efficiently maximized by the EM algorithm. We also propose a model selection procedure to choose the different features that contribute to define a specific multidimensional LC IRT model. In general, comparisons between different parameterizations are based on information criteria, in particular we rely on the Bayesian Information Criterion (Schwarz, 1978) or on likelihood ratio (or Wald) test, being this last tool useful in presence of nested models. First of all, we suggest to verify the reasonableness of the discreteness assumption by selecting the number of latent classes. In order to obtain a more parsimonious model, this first phase of the model selection should be performed with reference to the standard LC model. Then, given the selected number of latent classes and the most general parameterization about items and dimensionality, the choice among global, local or continuation ratio logit link functions may be performed, so that a graded response or a partial credit or a sequential model is selected. This phase should also take into account the interpretability of the type of logit with reference to the specific application problem. The next phase consists of choosing the number of latent dimensions and the allocation of items within each dimension. This phase may be more or less complex depending on a priori information about the dimensionality structure of the questionnaire. Finally,

possible constraints on the item discriminating and difficulty parameters are selected, by comparing nested models that are equal as concerns all the other elements.

The class of multidimensional LC IRT models for ordinal items and the proposed model selection procedure are illustrated through an application to a dataset, which concerns the measurement of psychopathological disturbs (i.e., anxiety and depression) in oncological patients by using the Anxiety and Depression Scale of Zigmond and Snaith (1983). The results show that subjects can be classified in three latent classes, and the item responses can be explained by a graded response type model with items having the same discriminating power and different distances between consecutive response categories. The bidimensionality assumption is rejected in favor of unidimensionality, so that all items of the questionnaire measure the same latent psychopathological disturb.

References

- Adams, R., Wilson, M., and Wang, W. (1997). The multidimensional random coefficients multinomial logit. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 21:1–24.
- Agresti, A. (1990). *Categorical data analysis*. Wiley, New York.
- Agresti, A. (1993). Computing conditional maximum likelihood estimates for generalized Rasch models using simple loglinear models with diagonals parameters. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 20:63–71.
- Andrich, D. (1978). A rating formulation for ordered response categories. *Psychometrika*, 43:561–573.
- Bartolucci, F. (2007). A class of multidimensional IRT models for testing unidimensionality and clustering items. *Psychometrika*, 72:141–157.
- Birnbaum, A. (1968). Some latent trait models and their use in inferring an examinee’s ability. In Lord, F. M. and Novick, M. R., editors, *Statistical Theories of Mental Test Scores*, pages 395–479. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Christensen, K., Bjorner, J., Kreiner, S., and Petersen, J. (2002). Testing unidimensionality in polytomous Rasch models. *Psychometrika*, 67:563–574.
- Colombi, R. and Forcina, A. (2001). Marginal regression models for the analysis of positive association of ordinal response variables. *Biometrika*, 88:1007–1019.
- Dempster, A. P., Laird, N. M., and Rubin, D. B. (1977). Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 39:1–38.
- Duncan, O. and Stenbeck, M. (1987). Are Likert scales unidimensional? *Social Science Research*, 16:245–259.
- Formann, A. K. (1992). Linear logistic latent class analysis for polytomous data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87:476–486.

- Formann, A. K. (2007). (almost) equivalence between conditional and mixture maximum likelihood estimates for some models of the Rasch type. In von Davier, M. and Carstensen, C., editors, *Multivariate and Mixture Distribution Rasch Models*, pages 177–189. Springer-Verlag: New York.
- Glonek, G. and McCullagh, P. (1995). Multivariate logistic models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, 57(3):533–546.
- Goodman, L. A. (1974). Exploratory latent structure analysis using both identifiable and unidentifiable models. *Biometrika*, 61:215–231.
- Haberman, S. J., von Davier, M., and Lee, Y. (2008). Comparison of multidimensional item response models: multivariate normal ability distributions versus multivariate polytomous ability distributions. Technical report, ETS Research Rep. No. RR-08-45, Princeton, NJ: ETS.
- Hambleton, R. K. and Swaminathan, H. (1985). *Item Response Theory: Principles and Applications*. Kluwer Nijhoff, Boston.
- Heinen, T. (1996). *Latent class and discrete latent traits models: similarities and differences*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Hemker, B., Van der Ark, L., and Sijtsma, K. (2001). On measurement properties of continuation ratio models. *Psychometrika*, 66(4):487–506.
- Hojtink, H. and Molenaar, I. (1997). A multidimensional item response model: constrained latent class analysis using the Gibbs sampler and posterior predictive checks. *Psychometrika*, 62:171–190.
- Kelderman, H. (1996). Multidimensional rasch models for partial-credit scoring. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 20:155–168.
- Kelderman, H. and Rijkes, J. (1994). Loglinear multidimensional IRT models for polytomously scored items. *Psychometrika*, 59(2):149–176.
- Langheine, R. and Rost, J. (1988). *Latent trait and latent class models*. Plenum, New York.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F. and Henry, N. W. (1968). *Latent Structure Analysis*. Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Lindsay, B., Clogg, C., and Greco, J. (1991). Semiparametric estimation in the rasch model and related exponential response models, including a simple latent class model for item analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 86:96–107.
- Martin-Löf, P. (1973). *Statistiska modeller*. Stockholm: Institutet för Försäkringsmatematik och Matematisk Statistisk vid Stockholms Universitet.
- Masters, G. (1982). A Rasch model for partial credit scoring. *Psychometrika*, 47:149–174.
- Masters, G. (1985). A comparison of latent trait and latent class analyses of Likert-type data. *Psychometrika*, 50(1):69–82.
- Maydeu-Olivares, A., Drasgow, F., and Mead, A. (1994). Distinguishing among parametric Item Response models for polychotomous ordered data. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 18(3):245–256.

- Molenaar, I. (1983). *Item steps (Heymans Bulletin 83-630-OX)*. University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.
- Muraki, E. (1990). Fitting a polytomous item response model to Likert-type data. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 14:59–71.
- Muraki, E. (1992). A generalized partial credit model: application of an EM algorithm. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 16:159–176.
- Muraki, E. (1997). A generalized partial credit model. In Van der Linden, W. and Hambleton, R. K., editors, *Handbook of modern item response theory*, pages 153–164. Springer.
- Nering, M. L. and Ostini, R. (2010). *Handbook of polytomous item response theory models*. Taylor and Francis, New York.
- Rasch, G. (1960). *Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment tests*. Danish Institute for Educational Research, Copenhagen.
- Reckase, M. (2009). *Multidimensional Item Response Theory*. Springer.
- Rijmen, F., Tuerlinckx, F., De Boeck, P., and Kuppens, P. (2003). A nonlinear mixed model framework for Item Response Theory. *Psychological Methods*, 8(2):185–205.
- Rost, J. (1991). A logistic mixture distribution model for polychotomous item responses. *The British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 44:75–92.
- Samejima, F. (1969). Estimation of ability using a response pattern of graded scores. *Psychometrika Monograph*, 17.
- Samejima, F. (1972). A general model for free-response data. *Psychometrika Monograph*, 18.
- Samejima, F. (1995). Acceleration model in the heterogeneous case of the general graded response model. *Psychometrika*, 60:549–472.
- Samejima, F. (1996). Evaluation of mathematical models for ordered polychotomous responses. *Behaviormetrika*, 23:17–35.
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *Annals of Statistics*, 6:461–464.
- Smit, A., Kelderman, H., and van der Flier, H. (2003). Latent trait latent class analysis of an Eysenck personality questionnaire. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(3):23–50.
- Thissen, D. and Steinberg, L. (1986). A taxonomy of item response models. *Psychometrika*, 51:567–577.
- Tutz, G. (1990). Sequential item response models with an ordered response. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 43:39–55.
- Van der Ark, L. A. (2001). Relationships and properties of polytomous Item Response Theory models. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 25:273–282.
- Van der Linden, W. and Hambleton, R. K. (1997). *Handbook of modern item response theory*. Springer.

- Vermunt, J. (2001). The use of restricted latent class models for defining and testing non-parametric and parametric item response theory models. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 25:283–294.
- von Davier, M. (2008). A general diagnostic model applied to language testing data. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 61(2):287–307.
- von Davier, M. and Rost, J. (1995). Polytomous mixed Rasch models. In Fischer, G. and Molenaar, I., editors, *Rasch models. Foundations, recent developments, and applications*, pages 371–379. Springer-Verlag: New York.
- Wright, B. and Masters, G. (1982). *Rating Scale Analysis*. Mesa Press, Boston.
- Zhang, J. (2004). Comparison of unidimensional and multidimensional approaches to irt parameter estimation. Technical report, ETS Research Rep. No. RR-04-44, Princeton, NJ: ETS.
- Zigmond, A. and Snaith, R. (1983). The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 67(6):361–370.